

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, and 14 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 7-8, 10-12, and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakai et al. (Published U.S. application 2003/0012550). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai in view of Lenihan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,169,843). Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai in view of Lenihan and Nakatani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,118,924). However, Applicants believe Sakai, Lenihan, and Nakatani (alone or in combination) fail to meet the present invention for at least the following three reasons.

First, the present claims now recite "said Bridge Clip AV stream consisting of a preset portion of a first AV stream and a preset portion of a second AV stream" (Claims 1, 7-8, 10-12, and 14) As shown in Figure 37, the Bridge Clip consists of portions of clip 1 and clip 2. Importantly, the portions in the Bridge Clip are unchanged from clip 1 and clip 2. For example, the portions have not been edited with a transitional special effect such as a wipe. Also, the portions in the Bridge Clip are not removed/erased/deleted from clip 1 and clip 2. After carefully reviewing the Sakai reference, it is unclear whether the combined AV stream is recorded. For example, Sakai states "the system control circuit 15 outputs the result of the editing together with the special effects without modifying any material and without recording the edited result to the optical disk 1."

(Paragraph [0071]) Accordingly, Sakai fails to meet the recorded Bridge Clip AV stream as recited in the present claims.

Second, the present claims recite "wherein said Bridge Clip AV stream maintains continuity to achieve a seamless playback." (Claims 1, 7-8, 10-12, and 14) In the present invention, the Bridge Clip is used to bridge the tracking delay caused when reproducing discontinuous clips which are physically separated on the disc. This allows the present invention to reproduce discontinuous clips in real-time; i.e. seamlessly. Hence, seamless playback refers to a time continuity rather than a spatial continuity such as a transitional effect as taught in Sakai. Sakai does not discuss using the combined AV stream to "achieve a seamless playback" as required in the present invention.

Third, the present claims recite "clip stream type information for the Bridge Clip AV stream." (Claims 1, 7-8, 10-12, and 14) As shown in Figure 47, the clip stream type information is a bit flag which indicates whether the AV stream is a Bridge Clip. By contrast, Sakai discloses "an edit list 30 describing the transition periods and transition mode finalized by the operator." (Paragraph [0067]) Sakai does not disclose a bit flag indicating the type of AV stream as required in the present invention.

Accordingly, for at least these three reasons, Sakai, Lenihan, and Nakatani (alone or in combination) fails to meet all of the recited limitations, and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

Dated: October 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Darren M. Simon

Registration No.: 47,946

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant